



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box, 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,515	01/11/2001	Rainer Ludwig	HOE524	8391
7590 11/28/2003			EXAMINER	
Edward J. Timmer			RAEVIS, ROBERT R	
Walnut Woods Center 5955 W. Main Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Kalamazoo, MI 49009			2856	
		DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Ap	plication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			· /758,515	LUDWIG, RAINER				
			aminer	Art Unit				
			pert R. Raevis	2856				
	The MAILING DATE of this commu	1		1				
P riod fo	P riod for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filled after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status								
1)🛛	☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 October 2003</u> .							
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊡ This actio	on is non-final.					
3) 🗌	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4) 🖾	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	Claim(s) <u>3,6,11-36</u> is/are objected to.							
8)[_]	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	on Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10)[]	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
44)[]	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.								
	14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific							
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.								
Attachment	r(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			y (PTO-413) Paper No(s)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)			Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/758,515

Art Unit: 2856

DETAILED ACTION

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21, 22, 23, 24 and 28 of copending Application No. 09/758,513. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from one another.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 10 (of this application) are identical to claims 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28 (of the '513 application), except claim 1 refers to "maximum possible" (line 2 from last of claim 1) while claim 21 refers to "maximum permissible" (in intermediate claim 20, line 2 from last).

As the phrase "maximum possible" is in effect broader than the phrase "maximum permissible", claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 10 of this instant application are broader than those of the '513 application, and thus obvious.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 2856

Claims 3, 6, 11-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

No Terminal Disclaimer relating to the 09/758,513 application is in the US files.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert R. Raevis whose telephone number is 703-305-4919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30am to 4:00pm. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

ROVER